

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1-12 were pending in this application. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended hereby. Support for the amendment to these claims can be found, for example, in the paragraph bridging pages 6 and 7 of the present application. For the reasons stated below, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims pending in this application are in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action claims 1, 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,814,803 to Olmstead et al., and the remaining claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over various combination of Olmstead et al. and at least one of U.S. Patent 6,366,866 to Kanagawa et al., U.S. Patent 6,724,245 to Kwon et al., and U.S. Patent 5,038,096 to Obie et al. To the extent these grounds of rejection might still be applied to claims presently pending in this application, they are respectfully traversed.

As shown in Figures 2 and 3, the present invention is directed to an interface circuitry of a display chip 2. The interface circuitry includes an input node 20, a filter 24 and a clamping circuit 22. The input node 20 is provided for receiving an analog image signal with a display mode. The filter 24 provides a variable bandwidth in response to the display mode and processes the analog image signal accordingly. The filter 24 can be implemented by means of a variable resistor R_f and a capacitor C_f . The clamping circuit 24 is used to clamp the processed image signal by the reference level during a clamping interval.

The feature that the filter provides a variable bandwidth in response to the display mode is now expressly recited by the claims. However, neither Olmstead et al. nor Obie et al. disclose a "filter provides a variable bandwidth in response to said display mode" as recited in the currently amended claims 1 and 7. As such, these claims, and the claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinguishable from these cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 and §103 grounds of rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

SHAW PITTMAN LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102
Tel: 703/770-7900

Date: September 7, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

STERLING SMITH

By: *for*

Lawrence D. Lin (41,009)
Michael D. Bednarek
Registration No. 32,329

Attachments: None

MDB/LDE/ggb

Customer No. 28970